

REMARKS:

The Office action mailed June 9, 2006 has been received and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the application as amended hereby is respectfully requested.

It is noted with appreciation that dependent Claims 8, 14 and 20 were found to include subject matter that distinguishes from the prior art. Therefore, Claims 8, 14 and 20 have been rewritten as independent Claims 21, 22 and 23 respectively which are urged to be allowable.

The remaining claims were rejected as anticipated by Morrison. The Examiner has indicated that "it is also noted that a helically extending 'flange' does not require any special structure and could easily refer to an ordinary thread". Applicant could not disagree more. As was previously stated, the flange is being ignored and it is considered to be the most important element of the claims. If we look at references outside the application, we note that the definition given in the McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms, Fourth Edition, identifies a flange as a projecting rim of an organism or mechanical part. The Morrison device utilizes a reverse angle thread form that has upper and lower surfaces that are radially linear. There is no projecting rim on either the upper or lower surface.


Turning to the application, the term flange is extensively

discussed beginning on page 11 line 16 and continuing to page 12 line 17 with additional disclosure throughout. In the specification, the flange is described broadly as having a contour with a mating flange having a complementary contour such that the two interlock when rotated together. The claims call for at least one of the surfaces to be compound. Morrison's thread extends linearly outward from the body and has no compound trailing or leading surface. Furthermore, Morrison's mating threads do not radially interlock, but rather can easily slide relative to one another. Because the claims in discussion call for radial interlocking and a compound trailing or leading surface, it is urged that Morrison does not anticipate applicant's invention, nor does it in any way teach or suggest applicant's inventive closure. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 to 7, 9 to 13 and 15 to 19 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone, if prosecution of this application can be expedited thereby.

Respectfully Submitted,

JCM:lm
PO Box 30069
Kansas City, Missouri
64112
Phone: (816) 531-3470




John C. McMahon
Reg. No. 29,415
Attorney

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner For Patents,
P.O. Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on
September 1, 2006.

Roger P. Jackson
(Applicant)

By



September 1, 2006

(Date of Signature)